

REMARKS

Claims 84-86, 88-92, and 94-147 were pending as of the Office Action mailed December 10, 2009. No claims are being amended. Additionally, claims 84-86, 88-92, and 94-147 are being cancelled without prejudice, and claims 148-174 are being newly added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as filed.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing new claims and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks examiner Greene for the courtesy of the in-person/telephone interview on March 3, 2010. The time spent with the applicant's representatives Sanjay Gadkari, Arrienne M. Lezak, Kirk Gottlieb, and Xin Ma was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the claims were discussed in view of the cited references. No agreement was reached.

Amendment to the Specification

The specification has been amended as noted above. Specifically, the title has been changed from "Method and Apparatus for Enforcing Software Licenses" to "System, Method, and Apparatus for Authorizing Access".

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 84-86, 88-92, and 94-147 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,204,897 ("Wyman") in view of alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA"), in further view of 116 USPQ 443,444 (CCPA 1961) ("Wolfe"), in further view of Table C of the 1997 Census report ("Census"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,481,706 ("Peek").

Claims 84-86, 88-92, and 94-147 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,553,143 ("Ross") in view of alleged AAPA, Wolfe, Census, and Peek.

As noted above, claims 84-86, 88-92, and 94-147 have been cancelled without prejudice. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

New Claims 148-174

Support for new claims 148-174 is noted above. The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Wyman, alleged AAPA, Wolfe, Census, Peek, and Ross, alone or in combination, do not teach or describe each and every aspect of new claims 148-174. Thus, the applicant submits that new claims 148-174 are allowable.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

The three-month extension of time fee in the amount of \$1,110 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 10, 2010

By: /Xin Ma/

50718235.doc